

---

---

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY  
STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT  
MINUTES**

June 20, 2002  
10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.  
&  
June 21, 2002  
8:30 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Arizona State Courts Building  
Conference Room 345  
1501 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

---

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Louraine Arkfeld, COT  
John Barrett, TAC  
Kent Batty, COT  
Michael Baumstark, COT  
Ron Beguin, TAC  
Tom Brady, CACC  
J. William Brammer, Jr., *stand in for Joseph Howard, COT*  
Bobbie Chinsky, PACC  
John Coward, TAC  
David A. Davis, TAC  
Robert Dorfman, COT  
Diane Drain, COT  
Gordon Griller, COT  
Margaret Guidero, CACC  
Joan Harphant, TAC  
Jeanne Hicks, COT  
Donald Jacobson, CACC  
Michael Jeanes, COT  
John Kennedy, COT  
Gary Krcmarik, COT  
Martin Krizay, COT  
Rod Marquardt, PACC  
Diane McGinnis, PACC  
Ruth McGregor, COT  
C. Steven McMurry, CACC  
Carol Merfeld, TAC  
Gordon Mulleneaux, CACC  
Clark Munger, COT  
Gregg Obuch, CACC  
Michael Pollard, CACC

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Eloise Price, TAC  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, CACC  
Janet Scheiderer, CACC  
Will Tagart, TAC  
Cheryl Townsend, PACC  
Edward Voss, COT

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, TAC  
Henry Manuel Alvarez, COT  
Barbara Broderick, PACC  
Sue Castaneda, TAC  
Daniel W. Edwards, TAC  
Thomas Gronski, PACC  
Alma Haight, CACC  
Frank Maiocco, CACC  
Patricia Noland, CACC  
Debbie Olsen, PACC  
Richard Wood, PACC  
Myrtle Young, PACC

**GUEST**

Kathy Brauer  
Janet Cornell  
Donna Cross  
Cary Meister  
Paul Nowak  
Sarah Shew  
Mike Ullery  
Jill Woods

**AOC STAFF PRESENT**

Theresa Barrett  
Kate Bibber  
Dave Byers  
William Earl  
Gary Graham  
Jim Ham  
Maureen Haggerty  
Karl Heckart  
Paul Hrisho  
Diana Jones  
Tim Lawler  
Adele May  
Stephanie Nolan  
Pamela Peet  
Pamela Pucetas  
Ted Wilson  
Amy Wood

## **WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

Vice Chief Justice McGregor called the meeting of the Commission on Technology to order on June 20, 2002 at 10:00 a.m. Justice McGregor welcomed members, staff and guests present. Members introduced themselves giving their name and position.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2002, Commission on Technology Meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-02**

## **THE VISION**

Justice McGregor introduced the topics and activities for the two-day meeting. She asked that participants look at proposed plans and projects to determine how they fit into the overall strategic initiatives of the court system statewide. To provide a framework for this, Justice McGregor reviewed some of the technology-related initiatives in *Justice for A Better Arizona: A Strategic Agenda for Arizona's Courts 2002-2005*. Justice McGregor also reminded the members of comments made by Chief Justice Jones at the January Commission meeting noting three questions that the Commission must ask when presented with new projects:

- Does this project provide for a critical need?
- Does it improve the courts?
- What is the funding?

Justice McGregor thanked the members of the Commission for keeping a broad perspective and supporting technology use that is in the best interest of the judiciary as a whole.

## **SYSTEMIC THINKING**

Justice McGregor stressed the value of using a systemic thinking approach, which is the Commission's top strategic priority, in determining priorities. She asked Karl Heckart to present more on the underlining principles of systemic thinking and how the group might apply them to the issues before them.

Karl defined systemic thinking as a holistic approach to all business and technology undertakings. He suggested that the COT agree on a conceptual framework for determining when a project needed to be looked at with broad horizontal and vertical perspectives as being strategic, holistic and aligned with court goals. He noted that some projects could be considered "opportunistic" and be undertaken outside of the systemic approach but that they needed to be viewed as reactive, aligned with immediate line-of-business needs, and having a short return on investment period and planned obsolescence. Karl noted that the benefit of using a systemic thinking approach is that it works for the greater good, encourages the adopting best practices, improves investment performance and provides leverage through standards.

Karl responded to participants' questions and comments about the information presented. Members expressed the hope that addressing best practices does not translate into settling for the least common denominator. They also discussed funding and politics as factors to consider.

## **WHERE WE ARE**

Karl made a presentation on the current trends in technology and the courts as another factor to consider in evaluating project approaches and priorities. He covered the current state of the industry, showing a Gartner Group “Hype Cycle” chart which depicted a timeline of technology-related advancements. Major trends included business activity monitoring (BAM), security, wireless and mobile computing, integration and vendor survival concerns. He outlined several factors driving court technology use, including local court needs, integration needs, e-court and public access. Given the many common directions, he stressed how courts can gain leverage if the processes are standardized, parts are reused, systems are not reinvented, and state and local resources are pooled.

Justice McGregor then asked participants to split into five breakout groups to address approaches, directions and issues in the following topics:

1. Probation
2. Justice Integration
3. Centralized Processing
4. Operational Coordination, Security, Change Management
5. Funding Strategies

They were then provided with guidelines for using systemic thinking principles in their breakout sessions:

- \$ Be an idealistic pragmatist
- \$ Analyze drivers and issues
- \$ Brainstorm solutions & approaches
- \$ Consider systemic and opportunistic factors
- \$ Prepare concrete recommendations for the Commission

The members convened as breakout groups with the assignment to use the afternoon to review and analyze selected issues within each topic and return the following morning with recommendations for the Commission as a whole to consider.

## **BREAKOUT SESSIONS PRESENTATIONS**

**Commission on Technology Strategic Planning Retreat resumed Friday June 21, 2002 promptly at 8:30 a.m. with each breakout group presenting. Each breakout group reported on its respective group’s findings. The recommendations are outlined below.**

### **PROBATION - Presented by Martin Krizay**

The Probation group made recommendations that included having the existing Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) work with the adult and juvenile probation steering committees to review recommendations and having PACC set overall goals and submit priorities to the COT in a written report. Other recommendations included funding the APETS (the Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System software) rollout and implementation in Yuma and Pima County in 2003 and to direct PACC to study and recommend plans to implement APETS in remaining counties. By general consensus, members indicated their support for the

recommendations. No specific policies or action plans were adopted by motion.

**JUSTICE INTEGRATION** - Presented by Gary Krcmarik

Justice Integration breakout group recommended focusing on technology that will have the best R.O.I. and starting with highest volume and inter-court data sharing. The group made recommendations regarding funding that included broadening funding to include pooled local/state and federal sources. Other recommendations included standardizing technology and establishing a COT steering committee to bring leaders to the table, monitor and promote justice integration efforts on behalf of the COT, and explore funding opportunities. By general consensus, members indicated their support for the recommendations. No specific policies or action plans were adopted by motion but it was agreed that an ad hoc committee should develop a more detailed plan for integration priorities and projects for the next strategic planning session.

**CENTRALIZED PROCESSING** - Presented by Judge Robert Dorfman

The Centralized Processing group provided a list of potential candidates for centralization that included citations processing, jury processing, collections, electronic filing and document management, legal research, data sharing and transfer, self service center and forms standardization, security, training and the judicial directory. They provided some factors that could be considered in the centralization decision like cost, availability of technical expertise, and the need for centralized data stores with high availability. The group recommended having no formal governance structure but having standardized policies and process direct centralization efforts. By general consensus, members indicated their support for the recommendations. No specific policies or action plans were adopted by motion but it was agreed that more detailed criteria for analyzing centralization candidates should be developed within an ad hoc committee that should report back to the Commission in September.

**OPERATIONAL COORDINATION, SECURITY AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT** -

Presented by Michael Jeanes

The Operational Coordination group proposed that a COT subcommittee, the AOC and TAC work cooperatively to develop policies to assure secure systems within the judiciary. They recommended that requirements and processes be documented for network connectivity, change management and security auditing. They presented a matrix of recommended approaches for selected issues such as virus detection, wireless networks and data encryption. They proposed that the Commission form a subcommittee to develop policies for COT's consideration; TAC may be asked to develop specific technical standards and guidelines for their consideration. No specific policies or action plans were adopted by motion but the Commission agreed that an ad hoc committee should work with the AOC to develop policies for consideration.

**FUNDING** - Presented by Kent Batty

The Funding group recommended several possible approaches to increasing funding available for technology projects. They proposed creating a COT subcommittee to research these possible alternative funding mechanisms, including increasing local court fees, subscription fees, value-added service fees. No specific policies or action plans were adopted by motion but it was agreed that an ad hoc committee should be formed and report back to the Commission at the next meeting.

Members discussed each presentation, clarifying specific recommendations and voicing concerns

on some issues. In summary, there was a general consensus to accept recommendations and create COT ad hoc committees for each of four areas. Committee members would be volunteers from COT, CACC, TAC, PACC and interested court and public participants.

- A Funding committee will work with the AOC and provide the COT with specific alternatives for further action at the next meeting in September.
- A Centralized Processing committee will work to develop a methodology for selecting which projects are candidates for a centralized implementation and more fully define centralization options and definitions. They will present their findings to the COT for consideration at the next meeting in September.
- A Justice Integration committee will pursue the goals outlined by the breakout group.
- An Operational Coordination committee will work with AOC technical staff to develop proposed policies and procedures for COT consideration.

The existing PACC subcommittee will pursue the recommendations of the Probation breakout group. Anyone interested in participating in a committee should contact COT staff.

### **PROJECT FUNDING**

Karl Heckart presented the current status of funding and discussed funding issues and their respective priorities. He presented a five-year projection that included current funding commitments and conservative revenue projections. It was agreed that new sources for funding technology need to be developed. Then members discussed funding of three projects for fiscal year 2004.

- Extending the funding for the field trainer program beyond next year.
- Acquiring a high-availability backup and recovery server for the ACAP.
- Replacing the old data warehouse server whose capacity has been reached.

There was much discussion about the relative merits of these projects. Specifically, the AOC operational group was asked to confirm the preliminary analysis that it was not viable to reuse the replaced data warehouse server as the high-availability server.

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the purchase of both the high availability server and the data warehouse server and to approve an additional one year of funding for the field trainer program. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-03**

### **COUNTY COURT STRATEGIC PLANS REVIEW**

Karl Heckart reviewed the county courts' strategic plans in groupings (rural, regional, metropolitan and appellate). He noted the expectation that the COT would further review projects referenced in plans if specifics were not included. All county plans reviewed were aligned with statewide initiatives. Some exceptions and project omissions were discussed, specifically electronic document management and jury processing upgrade projects. Several meeting participants noted that they had pending projects for these that were not referenced in their plans. Justice McGregor determined that she would issue a letter from her as COT Chair requesting that courts refrain from pursuing electronic document management (EDM) or jury acquisitions/upgrades until policies for the centralization issue were determined.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the rural county group's information technology strategic plans, including Apache, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Navajo and Santa Cruz, with the condition that they await more study on jury and EDM systems before proceeding. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-04

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the regional group's information technology strategic plans, including Cochise, Coconino, Mohave, Pinal, Yavapai and Yuma, with the condition that they await more study on jury and EDM systems before proceeding. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-05

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County courts' information technology strategic plan with a concern expressed for the lack of migration planning in the Pima Justice Court plan to replace a CMS which is becoming obsolete. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-06

Michael Jeanes then requested that the Maricopa County Justice Court portion of the Maricopa Courts' plan be removed from consideration since recent events will result in a change to those plans.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County courts' information technology strategic plan. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-07

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the appellate courts' information technology strategic plans including the Supreme Court and Division 1 and 2 of the Court of Appeals. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-08

### **STATEWIDE INITIATIVES AND DIRECTIONS**

In his CIO Report, Karl Heckart presented the accomplishments, status and key FY 2003 goals of current projects statewide. He updated members on current AZTEC application enhancements, discussed planned new versions and provided timelines for rollouts. Other projects reviewed include protective orders, the data warehouse, APETS rollout analysis, Palm development for APETS and JOLTS, Division 1's implementation of Appellamation, AOC and DPS integration projects, a new tax intercept program (TIP) server version, the PC refresh program, the migration to Windows 2000, the JOLTS GUI and Crystal Reports.

### **STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS DISCUSSION/SUMMARY**

Justice McGregor opened the floor to member questions and comments.

### **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.